

Appl. No. 09/766,027
Amdt dated November 3, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-34 and 48-60 were rejected in an Office Action dated August 3, 2004. All these claims are canceled, in order to expedite prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the canceled claims in a continuation application in future.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification in paragraph 8 on page 7 for references to internet URL references. The Examiner recommended that "http:/" should be removed. Accordingly, Applicants have modified the Specification as suggested by the Examiner.

The only remaining issue in the entire Office Action is an objection to the specification for references to Appendices that are on file in the case, as follows:

The disclosure should be a standalone document.

The examiner suggests either removing the references to the file or incorporation of the appendices into the case without adding new matter. The Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicants respectfully traverse this requirement. There is no indication whatsoever in the above-quoted text as to the specific page and line number in the specification to which the Examiner is objecting. The Examiner's failure to provide these details makes it difficult for Applicants to provide an appropriate response. Nonetheless, Applicants provide the following responses.

Applicants submit that MPEP § 608.01(b) is entitled "Abstract of the Disclosure [R-2]". This section of the MPEP is completely silent about the disclosure being "standalone". Therefore the Examiner has made an un-supported objection. If the Examiner continues to rely on this section of the MPEP to require the specification to be "standalone", the

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

2150 Mission College Blvd
Suite 300
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

Appl. No. 09/766,027
Amdt dated November 3, 2004

Examiner is hereby requested to quote the specific language being relied upon, in the next Office Action.

In the interests of furthering the prosecution of this application to completion, Applicants now respond to above-quoted text from the Office Action as if it was an objection to page 1 lines 8-31 of the originally filed specification. Applicants submit that this portion of the specification is in conformance with MPEP § 608.05(a) entitled "Deposit of Computer Program Listings [R-2]." Specifically, 37 C.F.R. § 1.96(c) permits Applicants to submit a computer program listing "As an appendix which will not be printed." This is contrary to the Examiner's requirement that the "disclosure should be a standalone document."

For the above-discussed reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw all objections, and allow this application to proceed to issuance.

Applicants are hereby amending the Abstract in the originally-filed application at page 53 as shown above, to conform to a maximum limit of 150 words currently in effect. A replacement sheet for the Abstract is attached hereto, for the Examiner's convenience.

To the extent the Examiner finds anything in this application that does not comply with any rule or guideline, the Examiner is hereby respectfully requested to make any necessary revisions by a formal examiner's amendment, so that this application can proceed to issuance. Applicants' authorization for such an amendment may be obtained by calling the undersigned at (408) 982-8200, ext. 3.

Via Express Mail Label No.
ER 205 700 067 US

Respectfully submitted,

S. Omkar

Omkar K. Suryadevara
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,320

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
1150 Mission College Blvd
Suite 960
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210